DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 678 CE 040 933

AUTHOR Lucas, Geoffrey S.
TITLE Non-Traditional Community-Based Rural GED Programming Outreach Efforts.
PUB DATE 16 Apr 85
NOTE 34p.; For a related document, see CE 040 934.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; Adult Students; *Community Programs; Cost Effectiveness; Delivery Systems; Educational Needs; Educational Practices; *High School Equivalency Programs; Needs Assessment; *Nontraditional Education; *Outreach Programs; Program Costs; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Rural Areas; *Rural Education; State of the Art Reviews; Statewide Planning; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A study examined nontraditional, community-based rural General Educational Development (GED) programming outreach efforts in Pennsylvania. Data for the study were obtained through two computerized bibliographic searches, interviews and phone calls to the GED Testing Division of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and from phone calls to the GED Testing Division in Washington, DC. These data indicated that rural adults want to play a role in both planning and directing adult educational programs. They want and need education and training that will empower them to be change agents within their respective communities; such training includes job training and retraining for members of both sexes and training targeted to meet the needs of women returning to the work force. Both family learning and community-based programs are needed. After analyzing several single- and multidimensional approaches to rural GED programming, it was recommended that planners of such programs in Pennsylvania do the following: develop comprehensive interorganizational community relationships and linkages, maintain a community education outlook, be willing to modify programming on an ongoing basis to respond to everchanging community needs, and maintain a constant awareness of future funding considerations. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254678

NON-TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY-BASED RURAL GED PROGRAMMING OUTREACH EFFORTS

BY

GEOFFREY S. LUCAS

APRIL 16, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Lucas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OE0240933

Geoff Lucas has been an adult educator for the past 13 years. He has his BA in English and an MEd in counseling; he's also a licensed reading specialist. Geoff designed and implemented one of the first adult learning centers for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, and he created a reading curriculum for one of Pennsylvania's state universities. His chief interest areas are Transactional Analysis and adult learning.

Geoff has conducted numerous workshops across Pennsylvania with JTPA groups, at Penn State University , with local community organizations, at the Pennsylvania Mid-Winter Adult Basic Education Association Conference. An article on "Hints on Individualization in ABE and GED" appeared in The Journal of Correctional Education, Volume 30, Issue #1 and Notes on Adult Education (AdvancE), Volume 6, No. 4:2. "Keep the Lid on! Corrections Education Facing a Full House," appeared in The Journal of Correctional Education, Volume 34, Issue #3.

He most recently completed a yearlong, rural, multi-dimensional, community-based, GED program, entitled Project GRADS. A final report is available through the ERIC Clearing-house. Geoff is presently a doctoral candidate in adult education at the Pennsylvania State University and was a recently featured presenter at the International Corrections Education Association Conference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Outline	p.i
Introduction	p.1
Acronyms	p.1
Overview of GED Testing	p.2
Brief History (GED)	p.2
Nature of Tests	p.3
State of Affairs in Pennsylvania	p.3
Traditional and Non-Traditional Programming	p.5
Author's Intent	p.6
Methodology	p.8
Nature of Rural Adult Learner	p.9
Educational Needs of Rural Adult Learner	p.10
Review of the Literature (Outreach Efforts)	p.11
Multi-Dimensional/Multi-Option Approaches	p.13
Single-Dimensional Programs	p.14
Comprehensive Regional Research and Development Approaches	p.16
A Model Prototype (GRADS)	p.18
Conclusion	p.20
References	p.24

NON-TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY-BASED RURAL GED PROGRAMMING OUTREACH EFFORTS

OUTLINE

I INTRODUCTION
- A. Acronyms
- B. Brief Overview of GED Testing
  - 1. Background of GED
    - a. Brief history
    - b. Nature of test
      - (1) Norms
      - (2) Readability level
    - c. State of affairs in Pennsylvania
      - (1) Demographic and statistical information
      - (2) Traditional and non-traditional rural programming outlook
        - (a) past
        - (b) present
- C. Author's Intent
  - 1. Personal appeal
  - 2. Need for self-emerging rural efforts
  - 3. Methodology
- D. What's To Be Gained By This Paper
  - 1. An update on the state of affairs of rural ABE/GED
    - a. Synthesize contemporary information
    - b. Identify need areas

II BODY
- A. Nature of Rural Learner
- B. Educational Needs of Rural Adult Learner
- C. Review of The Literature - Efforts at Rural Outreach
  - 1. Multi-dimensional/Multi-option approaches
  - 2. Single-dimensional approaches
  - 3. Comprehensive regional research and development approaches

4. A model Pennsylvania rural program prototype
   a. Project G.R.A.D.S.
      (1) Overview
      (2) Summary of results

III CONCLUSION
   A. Major Considerations
      1. Successful program marketing
         a. co-sponsoring
         b. linkages
      2. Community education outlook
      3. Flexibility
      4. Funding considerations
      5. Broad-based delivery system
      6. Individualization

NON-TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY-BASED RURAL GED PROGRAMMING OUTREACH EFFORTS

INTRODUCTION

Before providing an in-depth look at workable, low-cost non-traditional GED approaches, particularly as they apply to the rural adult learner, it is important to briefly examine the overall present state of affairs of the GED situation both nationally and locally in Pennsylvania. This overview serves to introduce this paper. It likewise functions as both an illustrative and comparative backdrop demonstrating the pressing need for realistic, alternative, non-traditional GED instructional approaches, especially in rural community areas. These areas have always been the least cost-effectively served by traditional GED program models.

ACRONYMS

GED - General Educational Development (test and diploma)
ABE - Adult Basic Education
GRADS - Grass Roots Alternative Diploma Study
KET - Kentucky Educational Tapes (GED)
ETV - Educational Television
RURAL - Regional Utilization of Resources to Aid Literacy
LIAS - Library Information Assistance Service

OVERVIEW OF GED TESTING

For many adults, passing the GED test represents an alternative means of earning a high school diploma. Since 1971, nearly five million adults have attained their GEDs (Spille, 1984). In Pennsylvania, number five in volume of testing nationwide, almost 23,000 adults participated in GED testing in 1984. Nationally, to include Canada as well, approximately 750,000 took the GED test in 1983; approximately 75 percent of these test takers were awarded the equivalency diploma (Spille, 1984). In 1981, about 15 percent of all the high school diplomas issued in the United States were GED diplomas (Cervera, 1983).

BRIEF HISTORY

Begun in 1942 by the Armed Forces Institute, GED tests were designed to give military personnel, who did not complete formal high school, an opportunity to demonstrate skill understanding commensurate to that of a high school graduate (Patience and Whitney, 1982). The broad scope and success of this program logically extended itself to the civilian community after World War II. With an increased emphasis focusing on educational competence, a high school diploma/GED might now be considered the minimum essential credential for economic and social survival in our society (Crabtree, 1979).

NATURE OF TESTS

The GED test battery consists of achievement tests in Writing Skills, Social Studies, Science, Reading Skills, and Mathematics. Norm groups of soon-to-be graduated high school seniors provide a statistical basis for comparison of GED examinee achievement The present minimum standard scores established indicate an attainment level equaled or exceeded by almost 70 percent of a norm high school student group (Patience and Whitney, 1982). Recently applied readability formulas to portions of the official GED Practice Test (similar in content to the actual test) do indeed corroborate the integrity of the equivalency credential. Overall, it appears that the five skill areas have an estimated average reading grade level of 10.6 (Fluke, 1984).

STATE OF AFFAIRS IN PENNSYLVANIA

As previously mentioned, Pennsylvania ranks fifth in the nation regarding the volume of adults GED tested. Only New York, California, Texas, and Illinois, respectfully, outrank Pennsylvania. In 1984, in Pennsylvania, over 17,000 successfully earned equivalency diplomas. The average participant was 25 years old, a third of whom used the GED as a vehicle for post-secondary training (Cica) 1983). Interestingly enough, almost 10,000 adults took the GED test in 1980 compared to the number of adults tested in 1984.

From 1982 to 1983 alone, Pennsylvania reflected an 11 percent decline in the number tested (Spille, 1984).

Overall, the present state of affairs of adult basic education (ABE) in Pennsylvania and nationwide suggests a poor commitment to ABE. Reduced adult education funding from 1981-82 to 1982-83 (Cica, 1983) has no doubt contributed to its present rank of fiftieth out of all of the fifty states in terms of the least financial support for adult education; Pennsylvania effectively reaches out to about two percent of its current adult target population (Gordon, 1982). An increase in the public school drop-out rate, as well, only further exacerbates the adult basic education situation. 1981-82 public school figures indicate that almost 27,000 dropped out of public school (Wingfiels, 1983); in 1984, nearly 31,000 dropped out. It is estimated that almost half of Pennsylvania's adults (25 and over) do not have high school diplomas.

In this time of declining program dollars and diminishing ABE budgets, somehow adult basic education must continue to try to meet the burgeoning needs of adults. Unfortunately, however, the situation remains bleak as more and more drop out of public school while funds continue to be cut. The problem is epidemic in urban areas and woefully extends far into the rural countryside as well.

TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL PROGRAMMING (Past and Present)

Most GED programs in Pennsylvania and nationwide operate out of urban public school buildings and are considered traditional in both teaching methodology and curriculum. Class enrollment generally ranges from five to twenty. Their single-modal programming approach often fails to take into account the special life needs of undereducated adults (Lenox, 1979). Program success, it appears, calls for more flexible multi-modal systems approaches (Treadway, 1984).

Unlike their urban counterparts, todays rural GED programs are frequently satellites of larger urban set-ups. These are victimized by small budgets, borrowed identities, and pitiful enrollment; most struggle from year to year realistically fearful of budget cuts or possible program non-renewal.

Non-traditional program efforts that penetrate rural areas have and do spring up and do demonstrate innovation, yet these are frequently experimental or demonstrative in nature, often funded for one year, and are usually characterized by top-heavy budgeting, unrealistic for today's trend toward austerity.

Adult education is and must be a major component of the community education movement. According to Morehead State University's Rural-Small Urban Demonstration (1975), successful adult education programs seem to encourage the total community education concept. It appears, however, that in rural America:

> "few schools have exhibited the capacity or leadership to provide even minimum community education programs such as ABE" (p.24).

Interestingly enough, there were a number of these big-budget innovative rural GED programs in the 1960's and 1970's, mostly in response to the once popular issue of rural poverty. Despite the activity generated by these efforts (Bruce, 1979):

> "almost nothing worked in the sense of initiating a national comprehensive program which showed continuity as well as direction" (p.12).

On the other hand, the real focus of concern for most of these programs was in the areas of research and demonstration. Large budgets, more available then than now, did produce results but sadly did not spawn anticipated program replication. Instead, they prompted only further competition both for resources and public support. One overwhelming result did suggest, rather strongly, that (Bruce, 1979):

> "such programs must belong to the community if they are to gain the commitment needed to sustain them and if they are to bring true integration into the community structure" (p.12).

Jack Minzey echoes these sentiments regarding community control in his book Community Education: From Program to Process (1972).

AUTHOR'S INTENT

Once again it is the intent of this paper to focus on low-cost community-based, rural alternative GED programming, to briefly highlight the nature of the rural adult learner and to explore

some of his/her educational needs as well. The emphasis, however, will concentrate on non-traditional, inexpensive prototypical program efforts that readily lend themselves to replication. Inherent throughout will be continued references to community integration and linkages, and multi-dimensional delivery systems approaches. Both concepts appear vital to the successful rural ABE program, especially in light of today's economic picture.

Over the past fifteen years, the United States has experienced a "rural turnaround" (Treadway, 1984). People are migrating into rural areas in unprecedented numbers. As a rural Pennsylvanian, I, too, am concerned about the future effectiveness of adult basic education, particularly rural GED programming. ABE/GED planning and teaching have been a large part of my professional life for the past twelve years.

It is also this author's belief that rural communities can establish their own program identities and not be ever so dependent upon traditional efforts that frequently overlook vital rural community needs. Professionals within the rural communities can effectively mobilize existing resources - businesses, organizations, and agencies, etc., - in a cooperative venture that has its roots within the community, while at the same time works in harmony and not in competition with already existing programs. One such low-cost program is Project GRADS (Grass Roots Alternative Diploma Study) which will be detailed later on and suggested as a realistic,

workable, replicable program model. GRADS was an independent rural GED program that not only augmented five traditional existing GED programs, but also provided a network for almost ten rural Pennsylvania communities; through intensive community linkage, GRADS managed an impressively low per-student cost of under $18.00.

METHODOLOGY

This investigation employed the following methodologies:

(1) Definitive bibliographical searches through ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center);

(2) A computerized bibliographical search at Pattee Library (LIAS) to include the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature;

(3) Interviews and phone calls to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, GED Testing Division;

(4) Assistance from the Pennsylvania Department of Education Resource Library;

(5) Phone calls to the GED Testing Division in Washington,D.C.

Hopefully, by the paper's end, this investigator will have provided an update on the state of affairs of rural adult basic education, in particular some of the more on-target GED program approaches that do work. In addition, I hope to synthesize contemporary information and identify need areas.

Before a review of the literature on non-traditional GED community-based programming, let us examine some of the characteristics of the rural adult learner in order to see why oftentimes his/her needs go unmet.

NATURE OF RURAL ADULT LEARNER

In his book, Higher Education in Rural America, Douglas Treadway (1984) alludes to a living pattern's shift to rural awareness especially notable in the final quarter of this century. Beginning in the 1970's, the population trend of the nation seems to be reversing itself reflecting a decreased growth in the more metropolitan areas: A shift away from urban living to a preference for a rural way of life. Treadway postulates that by the year 2000, the term "rural" will have little meaning as a descriptor of people's lives.

The focus, then, appears to need to shift from a typical urban program perspective to a more needed rurally-based one, requiring adaptive responses to this forecasted newer trend.

The following general characteristics describe the rural adult. First of all, he is older with fewer years of formal education than his urban counterpart. Secondly, he receives fewer public services (frequently isolated) and has a lower tax base. Most important is the fact that each rural community is unique and quite

unlike each other. Not only are financial resources limited, but people resources, too, are often lacking. Oftentimes adults who wish to continue their education must travel to urban areas.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF RURAL ADULT LEARNERS

In the following discussion about educational needs of the rural adult community dweller, many of these needs cited here in fact pose exciting challenges to adult educators. In general, scant information is available regarding rural needs (Bruce, 1979); however, some general characteristics do emerge:

(1) Rural adults want to have a role in both planning and directing adult educational programs (Treadway, 1984);

(2) Rural people seem to want education that relates both directly and practically to their specific needs (Treadway, 1984);

(3) Rural adults need job training and re-training (Kimmel and Lucas, 1984);

(4) Rural residents need education and training that will empower them to be change agents within their respective communities, to facilitate locally-based future social and economic decision making (Treadway, 1984);

(5) Considering the reduced economics of rural communities, coupled with distance problems and limited employment,

there is a strong need for inter-community linkages with a concomitant sharing of both money and people resources (Communi-Link, 1972);

(6) Rural women need educational programs in light of the woman-returning-to-work phenomenon (Treadway, 1984);

(7) There is a need for family learning as well as community learning to enable local rural communities to retain their separate identities (Brookfield, 1984).

In summary, it appears that rural needs are diverse. However, most pressing are the needs for community-based, self-generated, or, self-sustaining, need-oriented, long-term continuing education to include effective ABE/GED programming. Adults must play active parts in their educational plan (Lenox, 1979) rather than expect a pre-designed program format to meet all existing needs adequately. Multi-modal, multi-dimensional program approaches will be examined in the review of the literature.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE - Efforts at Rural Outreach

In general, most rural programs attempt to employ new delivery systems as a way of reaching out to isolated learners. These new systems, in the form of modern communications technology, include telephone instruction, TV instruction, radio and newspaper instruction, and computer-assisted instruction (Long, 1983). Most, if not

all of the programs reviewed in this section incorporate one or more forms of these delivery systems. When synthesized with independent and individualized study programs in an integrated systems-approach, these new delivery systems can perhaps better "serve as models for integrating all learning resources for adults in a rural area" (Treadway, 1984). In addition, these media can challenge adult education to strengthen their program capabilities thereby enhancing individualization techniques and counteracting the distance-education phenomenon.

What follows is an investigative attempt to review the available literature concerning program efforts at rural outreach. The author has identified three general divisions: (1) Multi-dimensional/Multi-modal option programs; (2) Single-dimensional programs; (3) Comprehensive regional research and development approaches, and (4) A model Pennsylvania program prototype.

These approaches represent model efforts to reach out to the inaccessible rural adult learner. Some succeed well in their undertaking while others appear to be "white elephants" overburdened by large budgets and mixed results. Most of the programs mentioned here do make use of the community education/total education approach. Some of the better ones are included in this review as they attempt to seek design plans exclusive to the populace for which they are intended; these, as one might expect, serve the rural adult well.

Although on the surface there seems to be a large number of worthy rural, community-based non-traditional ABE/GED efforts, only a dozen or so are mentioned here.

MULTI-DIMENSIONAL/MULTI-OPTION APPROACHES

One of the better multi-option programs originated in Alabama where statewide educational TV (ETV), learning centers and home tutors combined to effect an impressive penetration in Alabama's rural areas. By the program's end, 1600 received GED's, while only an estimated $87.00 was spent on each GED recipient (Jhin, 1975). Their techniques of program mobilization appear to be programatically sound:

R - Research of available agencies
E - Enthusiasm of staff about program
S - Systems approach
O - Optimistic objectives with definable goals
U - Utilization of resources - linkages with more than 200 agencies on a national, regional, state, and local level
R - Realistic approach to agencies for their support
C - Coordination of various agencies
E - Efficient management
S - Salesmanship for adult education (p.11)

A second multi-dimensional approach focused primarily on the efforts of KET (Kentucky Educational Tapes - a comprehensive video GED program). In addition to ETV, learning center, home study and classroom program components were harnessed. Of the 303 participants, over a three year period, approximately 80 earned their GED's. In Community Effectiveness Comparative GED Strategies, Volume 1, (Morehead, 1975), they state that,

> "the greatest need in adult education calls for differentiation-varying treatment procedures in response to varying needs. One program cannot serve all student needs ... There must be inter-agency collaboration. The greater degree of social, physical, psychological and economic isolation, the greater need for individualization: Multiple materials and alternative (study) places, e.g., in the home" (p.7).

The last multi-dimensional/multi-option program discussed here utilized the weekend-school approach. This rural New Jersey based project heavily emphasized its counseling services (supportive, follow-up and career) as the program mainstay. It combined independent study projects with subject area exams for credit and concluded that there is a greater likelihood of program success if adults can pick and choose their individual design plan. Forty-eight earned GED's with a surprising increase in enrollment the following year (Lenox, 1974).

SINGLE-DIMENSIONAL PROGRAMS

One of the more intriguing single-dimensional programs takes

place in Alaska. Sponsored by the Alaska State Board of Education, the Centralized Correspondence Study Handbook for Grades 1 - 12 (to include GED programs, has been enabling families in out-of-the-way communities to pursue their education sans formal school (Winger, 1982). Established in 1939, the comprehensive home study program boasts an extensive curriculum permitting alternative education. While there is no mention of enrollment figures, the program remains free to all.

A second single-dimensional program, Teleteacher (1979), employs cost-effective modified commercial transcribing equipment enabling ABE/GED students in out-of-the-way areas to have an alternative and convenient means of instruction. The telephone-based system permits 24 hour individualization with or without a teacher being present. This rural Virginia project reported that in less than two months three students studied for and passed the GED test. The attractive feature of this system, despite an $1100 cost per each teleteacher, is that the more lines operational (23¢/hour/line) the cheaper the per-hour cost becomes. It appears that one teleteacher could accomodate a large number of students; as more students enroll, a greater number of instructional aides is required to maintain adequate student contact. Overall, teleteacher appears to be an innovative and cost-effective single-dimensional program.

COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

The next area treated in this review of the literature examines comprehensive regional research and development approaches. The first such program approach is the well known Project Communi-Link where 26 selected rural communities in 14 western states formed an inter-organizational linkage system. This was attempted primarily to assist rural communities to improve the social and economic well-being of its citizenry through expanded, more comprehensive ABE/GED opportunities. It utilized existing and potential community resources (1972). Although Communi-Link offered no actual curriculum, its major focus was to initiate states toward the ultimate goal of establishing an integrated response and delivery system. It concluded that as a result of this effort, community needs were better met, resources more thoroughly assessed, and new or expanded programs for adults more widely implemented.

Hobbs and Hobbs (1979) presented a case study of a cooperative effort by Missouri school districts which examined almost 300 drop-outs from a needs assessment perspective. This involved the combined efforts of administrators, counselors, university faculty and drop-outs. What was particularly noteworthy about this regional research and development approach was the unexpected involvment of the drop-outs. This occurence helped to clarify the preconceptions of all

participants, paving the way for more effective communication and programming. This sensible approach to problem solving presents a strong case for field research as a vital tool for program planners, especially those who tend to misread rural communities as generally homogenous groupings.

Begun in 1981, Project RURAL (Regional Utilization of Resources to Aid Literacy), the last of the comprehensive regional approaches reviewed here, was launched in Centre County, Pennsylvania. It attempted to reach out to persons in rural regions as both an aid to combatting illiteracy and an alternative to traditional ABE/GED classes. Its multi-option support services included a dial-a-teacher feature, individualized help sessions at a variety of convenient locations throughout the region, plus ABE/GED home-study newspaper and TV lessons. A diversified delivery system was enhanced by an effective regional linkage system. Despite a strong enrollment of 900 adults and an impressive per-student cost factor of $29.00, Director Edith Gordon (1982) cites accountability difficulties and fails to delineate specific results: for instance, no mention is made of the number who earned GED's. This one year program's biggest accomplishment, however, was to significantly expand the area's local literacy council tutorial capabilities.

A MODEL PENNSYLVANIA PROGRAM PROTOTYPE
(Grass Roots Alternative Diploma Study)

Occasionally, a program emerges that takes an evolutionary course. It starts out on a small scale with only a few need areas. And as it develops, it continues to identify newer need areas, evolving into an entity quite unlike its initial design.

Such a course was inadvertently undertaken by Project GRADS (Kimmel and Lucas, 1984). Initially GRADS was begun by this author and colleague who attempted to deal with prison overcrowding at a Pennsylvania state correctional institution. But because of enthusiastic public support and extensive community linkages, GRADS rather rapidly expanded "outside the walls" to eventually include all of rural Huntingdon County, a central Pennsylvania area with a population of approximately 42,000 people.

The ultimate success of this entirely voluntary, ever-expanding effort rested with the community. Through local leadership activity, GRADS was able to thoroughly penetrate nearly every sector of the county and some of the outlying areas in nearby counties. Eventually almost thirty agencies and organizations facilitated its expansion.

GRADS employed a multi-modal, multi-option systems approach to rural GED instruction. Students could choose a study option(s) best suited to their needs. Newspaper lessons were made available to subscribers free as a public service. Local cablecasters, too,

televised free instructional lessons. As the majority of the would-be adult learners were without cable hook-up, seven tutorial study sites with closed circuit TV were set up to provide KET instructional lessons identical to those shown on cable TV; there were nine study sites in all. Five of the nine sites had already-existing ABE/GED programs that GRADS augmented with volunteer tutors, closed-circuit ETV and hostesses/greeters. These additional elements permitted doubled and tripled enrollments while not compromising individualized instruction. Extra sets of KET/ETV videotapes were acquired free from a variety of lenders nationwide. Volunteers coordinated all of GRADS efforts and dial-a-teacher/counselor capabilities enhanced outreach:

> "The most important thing about this project is the lesson it teaches (re:Flexibility and community support). When the KET/GED series was aired throughout the county, it was found that in-home viewing alone didn't work. So volunteers were enlisted, and tapes plus tutors did work. The materials they got the newspapers to publish were too difficult. So they substituted more basic instruction" (Royce, 1985, p.3).

Local industries and organizations donated money and materials while school districts provided the audio-visual equipment. Even the concerned citizenry, as well, pledged financial support, climbing on the community-cooperation bandwagon. A formal graduation highlighted the yearlong project.

Deemed a "must reading" for ABE administrators (Royce, 1985), GRADS graduated 150 rural adults and had a one-time enrollment of

between 300 and 400.

Royce does point out that this replicable model program regretfully lasted only one year as future funding was not available. This director, however, feels that post-project awareness may enhance the prospects for future funding. GRADS operated with a budget of about $7,000 in the form of a special projects state grant.

CONCLUSION

Adult education differs in many ways from any other field of education. According to Harold Beder (1977), its marginality, in comparison to elementary, secondary and higher education, makes it a low funding priority: "We are the last to receive, the first to loose, and we get less" (p.77).

As a result, adult educators, notably rural adult educators, must continue to seek out creative means for both program funding and development. In addition, the search for resources must be sufficiently diversified so that an adult education program not be dependent on any one source for its existence.

It is the aim of this paper to address non-traditional rural programming and its efforts, particularly as they apply to today's tight economic picture. An attempt was also made to

demonstrate the inability of most traditional GED programs to treat rural adult learner needs adequately. Current demographic information suggests a gross inefficiency on the part of adult education to offer sound rural programming in general. There are several major considerations underlying the formation of a positive plan, however.

Central to this thesis is successful program marketing involving linkage approaches in the form of co-sponsorship arrangements (Darkenwald, 1982). These require radical changes in how adult educators usually carry out educational programming.

First of all, comprehensive inter-organizational community relationships or linkages must be developed and maintained. Beder (1977) proposes a number of critical steps to effect this process:

(1) Start with contacts you already have;
(2) Identify the linkages of greatest benefit;
(3) Focus on community needs and on those of your prospective linking partner;
(4) Use students as linkers;
(5) Consider an advisory council approach;
(6) Increase program visability;
(7) Give and get (the quid pro quo);
(8) Secure supportive services and interagency friendships;
(9) Make your program compatible with linking partners;
(10) Gather intelligence on and for your linking partner and avoid conflict;

(11) Be honest;

(12) Cultivate friends and use them (pps. 33-72).

Secondly, a community education outlook is essential. Local citizens have the right to be involved in planning and development; individuals, businesses, and public and private agencies all have a stake in the mission of education (Boo and Decker, 1985) as a total community enterprise.

Thirdly, flexibility must be maintained to adapt ongoing program needs to changing times. Programs should consider ongoing community psychological, social, and historical needs (Long, 1983) so that program process and content can successfully meet and adapt to continual change. This is extremely important during the initial planning phase and throughout the program process.

Next, future funding considerations to maintain program operations are essential. These are critical. Without them, many good outreach efforts remain one-shot deals. Short-term monies that are supportive of innovative programs are generally available in the form of state grants. However, this is often short-lived funding with little opportunity for renewal. Low-cost rural program models, like GRADS and RURAL, would seem ideal in most rural settings, provided they are first adapted to suit each unique community area. Yet great care must be taken to insure their continuation. This planning for the future is best accomplished during ongoing program

operations and not at the program's end (Royce, 1985).

A sensible, convenient, broad-based delivery system is another critical area needed to be emphasized here, especially for the hard-to-reach adult (Zellers, 1981). Such a system must serve a two-fold function: first, it must provide educational training, and not hinder normal life/job patterns. Secondly, as Zellers (1981) states, "such a system should make full use of the technology that is available" (p.122).

Vital to any effective delivery system is its ability to provide an individualized plan. This can be best accomplished through multi-dimensional/multi-option program approaches. These provide lots of choices for the rural learner. They permit flexibility suitable to ongoing program adaptation and can be cost efficient if local and regional resources are wisely linked.

Huey Long foretells of the hard times ahead for second-chance programs, namely ABE/GED traditional and non-traditional ones which depend solely on the support of tax dollars. He states (1983):

> "Those without a need for remedial education will object to the use of tax funds for that purpose, while those who need such educational opportunity will fail to support programs by adequate participation" (p.186).

Surely the consequences of this prediction can be forestalled by both anticipating its likelihood and considering some of the major suggestions highlighted in this conclusion.

REFERENCES

Beder, Harold and Smith, Franceska. (1977). Developing an adult education program through community linkages. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the USA.

Boo, Mary R. and Decker, Larry E. (1985). The learning community. Washington, D.C.: National Community Education Association.

Brookfield, Stephen. (1984). Adult learners, adult education and the community. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bruce, Robert L. (1979). Adult education for rural Americans: An introductory review. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Cervero, R. (1983). A National survey of GED test candidates: Preparation, performance and 18 month outcomes. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 7, 13-29.

Cica, John T. (1983). Adult basic education programming in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Administrative survey of fiscal year 1982-83). Available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Community Education Comparative GED Strategies. (1975). Morehead, Ky.: Morehead State University, Appalachian Adult Education Center (Report No. CE 007 757) ERIC Document No. Ed 154 105).

Crabtree, Arthur P. (1972). General educational development for adults (available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education).

Darkenwald, Gordon G. and Merriam, Sharon B. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. N.Y.: Harper and Rowe.

Fluke, David W. (1984). Readability and the official practice GED. What's the Buzz? Pennsylvania's adult basic education newsletter, 4,4,3.

Gordon, Edith A. (1982). Project RURAL: A final report (available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education).

Hobbs, Daryl J. and Vickim. (1979). A research and development approach to rural education: A case study (Report No. RC 04 256). Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association in San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document No. ED 168 777).

Jhin, Kyo R. (1975) Top of Alabama regional education service agency adult secondary education program: A final report (Report No. CE 007 026). ERIC Document No. ED 123 354.

Kimmel, H.S. and Lucas, G.S. (1984). Project GRADS: A final report (available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education).

Lenox, James A. and Merriam S. (1979). The weekend adult school: An experiment in high school completion. Lifelong learning: The adult years, 3, 24-5.

Long, Huey B. (1983). Adult and continuing education: Responding to change. N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Minzey, Jack D. and Le Tarte, Clyde. (1972). Community education: From program to process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co.

Patience , W.M. and Whitney, D.R. (1982). What do the GED tests measure? Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Project Communi-Link. (1972). Multi-state project to develop coordinative rural basic education programming (Second year report). Fort Collins: Colorado State University (Report No. 007 461). ERIC Document No. ED 084 075.

Royce, Sherry. (1985). Project GRADS (Grass Roots Alternative Diploma Study). Focus on Curriculum, 1,4, 2-3.

Rural-Small Urban Demonstration: Volume 2: Part 1 (1975). Morehead, Ky.: Morehead State University, Appalachian Adult Education Center (Report No. CE 004 984). ERIC Document No. ED 112 165).

Spille, Henry A. and Whitney, Douglas R. (1984). The 1983 GED statistical report. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education.

Teleteacher. (1979). Lifelong learning: The Adult Years, 2: 25, 20-25.

Treadway, Douglas M. (1984). Higher education in rural America (Report No. RC 014 819). New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board (ERIC Document No. ED 245 868).

Winegar, Eileen. (1982). Centralized correspondence study handbook for grades 1-12. (Report No. RC 013 757). Juneau, Alaska: Alaska State Department of Education (ERIC Document No. ED 225 718).

Wingfield, Ronald. (1983). Dropout percentages (Available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education).

Zellers, Robert W. (1981). Establishing a rural county-wide adult basic education plan for the delivery of ABE services to sparsely populated communities. Community education expansion and outreach linkages: Impact on adult education, M. Ciavarella, ed., Shippensburg, PA: Shippensburg State College.